Interview Summary	10/743,214	BRODERSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael J. Hicks	2165	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):		
(1) <u>Michael J. Hicks</u> .	(3)		
(2) <u>Cyrus F. Bharucha (Attorney of Record)</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: <u>07 April 2009</u> .			
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)⊡ Video Conference c)⊡ Personal [copy given to: 1)⊡ applicant 2	²)∏ applicant's representative	e]	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed: Elsey, Thomas.			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)⊠ was not reached. h)⊡ N	I/A.	
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant presented proposed amendments and after discussion Examiner agreed to reconsider the standing rejection in view of the proposed claim amendments. No agreement as to the patentability of the claims was reached. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview			
requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	/Neveen Abel-Jalil/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art U	n#-0405	

Application No.

Applicant(s)